## REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks made herein.

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action, dated June 30, 2010, in which claims 1-3 and 6-8 were rejected. New claims 10 and 11 have been added, support for these claims can be found at least on page 3, lines 8-15. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 are independent claims.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 stand objected to because of the following informalities: the claims were missing proper punctuation where appropriate to facilitate understanding/clear interpretation of the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree, however, to further prosecution claims 1 and 3 have been amended to correct punctuation errors. The Final Office Action indicates a "Clean Copy" of the claims attached, demonstrates a possible solution. However, the clean copy was not attached to the Final Office Action, as mailed. Further the clean copy is also not in PAIR. Applicants request the proposed clean copy be sent to the applicants in a new office action.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 (Delorme). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 recite the limitations of "subsequently compute at least one provider providing said service and fulfilling at least one proximity condition with

respect to the computed itinerary by using a database of service providers, said proximity condition being adapted as a function of at least one of the following parameters: a transport mode and the type of traversed zones, and send a response comprising the computed itinerary with localization of the selected provider."

The Final Office Action indicates that the above limitations are shown in Delorme: "Fig 5, D - clearly shows traversed zones being considered." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fig 5D "illustrates a multimedia travelog preview about such a set of points of interest found along the route at 503 plus a related "map ticket" dialog box for transactional TRIPS user input e.g. to make reservations, buy tickets, get special offer coupons, and so forth – according to the present TRIPS invention. Thus, users are enabled to consider supplemental text, graphic and audio travel information on selected location or POIs nearby possible routes for purposes of making travel plans and arrangements in TRIPS."

Further, the Final Office Action points to Fig 3, '205 "input"; AND C7, 20-25 - "user defined"; AND C6, 60-68 - "waypoint selected by user" to show "a user to define at least one itinerary search criterion and at least one service". Applicants respectfully disagree. A waypoint selected by a user is simply that, a user selected geographical point of interest -- not a non-geographical service that a user is interested in. Moreover, a simple waypoint to an itinerary in no way teaches "subsequently compute at least one

provider providing said service and fulfilling at least one proximity condition with
respect to the computed itinerary by using a database of service providers, *said proximity*
*condition being adapted* as a function ..." as claimed.

According to the invention, at page 3, line 32 – page 2, line 15:

       an itinerary responding to certain criteria is first computed and
subsequently service providers situated in the proximity of the computed
itinerary are selected. In other words, the service providers are not
searched with respect to the current localization of the user entity, as is the
case in the above-mentioned prior art, but with respect to an itinerary
which the user entity is going to follow. It is not a matter of moving about
for the purpose of accessing a service but of benefiting from moving about
so as to access a service.

       The itinerary search criteria are, for example, a point of departure
and a point of arrival, or the current localization of the user entity and a
point of arrival. A transport mode (on foot, by car, by bus, by metro ...)
may also be defined.

       When a transport mode is defined as the itinerary search criterion,
***said proximity condition is adapted*** *as a function of said mode transport.*
*For example, the service provider may be nearer to the computed itinerary*
*if the user moves about on foot rather than by car. Similarly, the service*
*provider may be near a bus or metro station when the user moves about by*
*bus or metro.*

       Advantageously, ***said proximity condition is also adapted*** *to the*
*types of zones traversed by the itinerary. For example, in a part of the*
*itinerary situated in a country zone, the service provider may be further*
*away than in a part of the itinerary situated in town.*

As indicated in the Advisory Action, DeLorme teaches a system herein "Users
engage in an iterative planning process, revising or editing travel plans, previewing
travelogs of alternate routes, selecting point of interest parameters, comparing times and
costs of transportation options, in order to achieve a satisfactory travel plan."

However, DeLorme does not disclose or suggest the limitations of a proximity condition with respect to a computed itinerary, on the basis of which a service provider is selected, *is adapted as a function* of at least one of the following parameters: a transport mode, which has been defined as an itinerary search criterion, and the type of zones that the computed itinerary traverses. DeLorme does not disclose or suggest in any sense such adaptation of the proximity condition. In DeLorme, the proximity condition is exclusively user defined and applies to the entire itinerary. As the Advisory Action indicates on page 3, DeLorme teaches "Therefore, this hypothetical TRIPS user might well take advantage of TRIPS capabilities for locating and previewing of restaurants and other types of geographic points of interest (POIs) along a user-defined route…" That is, the user fixes an itinerary, which is used for the purpose of searching points of interest. Accordingly, DeLorme does not disclose or suggest any adaptation.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. DeLorme cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because DeLorme fails to disclose each and every element recited.

Having shown that the device resulting from the teachings of the cited reference does not include all the elements of the present invention, applicant submits that the reasons for the examiner's rejections of the claims have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection

and allowance of instant claims 1-3 and 6-8.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that all the objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment, all the rejections be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowance be issued is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

_/Thomas J. Onka/_____

Date: November 29, 2010

By: Thomas J. Onka
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,053

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax:   (914) 332-0615